## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a through search. In this paper, independent Claims 1, 10, and 23 are amended, Claim 36 is canceled, and no claims are added. Previously Claims 19-22 were canceled. Hence, Claims 1-18, 23-35, and 37-43 are pending in the application.

1.      ISSUES RELATING TO INFORMALITIES

The Office Action objected to Claim 38 for including the phrase "the Content Addressable Memory" without antecedent basis. Claim 38 is amended herein to address the informality. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

2.      ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

Claims 23-29 and 31-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Hoffman et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,094,435 (Hoffman). Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Hoffman et al. in view of Kerr et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,513,108 (Kerr). Claims 1-3 and 7-16 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over Hoffman et al. in view of Carvey et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,359,879 (Carvey). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

An anticipation rejection cannot stand if a rejected claim contains one or more elements, limitations or steps that are not found in the cited prior art reference. See *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548, 220 USPQ 193, 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Further, a rejection for obviousness is unsupported if the proposed combination of prior art references does not teach or suggest all elements of the claim or the complete claimed combination. Independent Claims 1, 10, and 23, from which all other claims depend directly or indirectly, are amended herein to

Docket No.: 50325-0756

9

recite subject matter not found in any of the cited references, alone or in combination. Therefore, all claims are patentable over the references of record.

In particular, Claims 1, 10, and 23 each recite **a network flow routing engine coupled to said second device, wherein the network flow routing engine determines network flow packet forwarding information in response to receiving network flow information associated with said output of said packet information extractor and provides said network flow packet forwarding information to said second device, wherein said second device uses said network flow packet forwarding information in generating said packet forwarding information.** In the case of Claim 23, the Fast Forwarding Engine (FFE) is referenced rather than the second device. In each of Claims 1, 10, and 23, the amendments clarify that determining packet forwarding engine is based at least in part on network flow information that is independently determined by a network flow routing engine. The amendment finds support and further explanation in the specification, e.g., pp. 13-14.

The cited references provide no teaching or suggestion about how to integrate a network flow routing engine into a router that provides a separate packet processing engine and fast forwarding engine.

Canceled Claim 36 formerly recited "A method as recited in Claim 23, wherein said Fast Forwarding Engine is coupled to a net-flow routing engine." In addressing canceled Claim 36, the Office Action contends that Hoffman shows a net-flow routing engine at col. 14, lines 4-11. This is incorrect. The cited passage of Hoffman merely provides that merge logic can instruct an input port to forward a packet as a layer 3 flow. In contrast, the claims recite that a network flow routing engine determines network flow packet forwarding information based on network flow information that the packet information extractor (or Packet Processing Engine) identifies for a packet, provides the network flow packet forwarding information to the second device (or Fast

Docket No.: 50325-0756

Forwarding Engine), and the second device determines how to forward the packet based at least in part on the network flow packet forwarding information. The vague reference in Hoffman to "forward a packet as a layer 3 flow" cannot be reasonably interpreted to suggest the claimed subject matter.

No other reference of record cures the deficiency of Hoffman.

For these reasons, Claims 1-18, 23-35, and 37-43 are patentable over Hoffman in view of Fritage Jr., and reconsideration is respectfully requested. The Office Action relies on Kerr and Carvey for other reasons and there is no hint that Kerr and Carvey teach anything to do with network flow determination, or generating packet forwarding information based on network flow information.

3.    CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for two (2) months and otherwise as necessary to make this reply timely filed. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted concurrently herewith. A check for applicable RCE fees and extension of time fees is attached. If the check is missing or insufficient, and throughout the pendency of this application, the Director is authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any over-

/ / /

/ / /

/ / /

Docket No.: 50325-0756

payments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Christopher J. Palermo
Reg. No. No. 42,056

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
(408) 414-1202
**Date:  October 17, 2005**
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

Docket No.: 50325-0756